

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1-19 stand rejection.

In claims 2 and 7 "the time" has been amended to "a time" for clarity. It is respectfully requested the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dally et al. (2004/001 2453 A1) (Dally).

It is respectfully submitted that Dally does not teach and every feature of the present claimed invention.

Applicant's claim 1 includes the feature of: an oscillating section having a phase-locked loop including a reactive element, for generating a signal with a predetermined frequency, and varying a reactance of said reactive element.

The Office Action points to the Abstract, paragraphs 4, 5, 7, 71 and 74, however Dally only describes that the frequency of the input signal is about equal to the resonant frequency. Par. 7 describes varying the conductance of resistors which is different from varying a reactance of a reactive element.

Paragraph 71 describes a coupler, paragraph 74 describes "that the coupler 203 phase locks the oscillator 205 to a multiple of the frequency of the reference clock..."

In contrast applicant is claiming varying a reactance of said reactive element when discriminating an instant preceding an instant which is a limit in said phase-locked loop being capable of maintaining its lock state.

Dally does not have a phase-locked loop including a reactive element, as the claimed invention. Dally merely discloses a phase controlled oscillator which is used for suppression of

the variation in pulse width, used for suppression of the jitter which is collateral to the clock, or used as a buffer which amplifies input signals such as clock signals.

As pointed out Dally discloses a phase controlled oscillator in contrast to applicant's phase-locked loop, therefore Dally cannot discriminate the instant preceding an instant which is a limit in the phase-locked loop being capable of maintaining its lock state, nor can Dally vary a reactance of the reactive element when this type of discriminating occurs.

Dally does not disclose nor imply at least the above features. Dally only discloses monitoring of the condition of the phase-lock loop.

Applicant's claim 2 includes the feature of: a resonator; and varying a resonance frequency of the resonator at a time of the detection by the limit discriminating section.

The Office Action points to paragraphs 4-6 however Dally is teaching a voltage controlled oscillator and does not describe a resonator as claimed by applicant.

Because Dally does not have a resonator, Dally does not disclose varying the resonance frequency of a resonator.

In addition Dally shows the output of the phase-frequency comparator is provided directly to the oscillator 205 outside of the phase-locked loop circuit which is in contrast to the control voltage in applicant's claimed invention.

Also in contrast to applicant's claimed invention Dally does not disclose detecting a control voltage reaching a predetermined value.

Applicant's claims 3 and 5 are different from Dally for at least the same reasons as stated above for claims 1 and 2.

Additionally, Dally does not disclose or indicate how, when the phase controlled oscillator or the clock multiplier is applied to a communication circuit, the clock signals

generated by a phase controlled oscillator or a clock multiplier can be used in the communication circuit.

Dally does not disclose what the period that the information signals are sent or received at a high transmission rate is when: 1) before an instant preceding an instant which is a limit in the phase-locked loop being capable of maintaining its lock state or before a first instant succeeding the preceding instant; or 2) after a predetermined time elapses from the first instant.


This, on the other hand, is disclosed in both claims 3 and 5.

The respective dependent claims include at least the distinguishing features discussed above plus additional patentable features.

In view of the remarks set forth above, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn and this application placed in condition for allowance. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below number prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJX 18.909 (100794-00134)
BSM:fd